DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 089 TM 850 513

AUTHOR Lysiak, Fae; Perez, Anna
TITLE A Multifaceted Approach to Teacher Evaluation.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985). Appendices contain small print.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Rating Scales; Competency Based Teacher Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Formative Evaluation; *Inservice Education; Job Performance; Principals; *Program Development; School Districts; Standards; Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Promotion
IDENTIFIERS *Fort Worth Independent School District TX; Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the three year process used in developing a teacher evaluation model for the Fort Worth (Texas) Independent School District. Based on Dr. Richard Manatt's School Improvement Model for Teacher Performance Evaluation, the purposes of the model were to improve teaching skills and to enable valid and reliable judgements concerning promotion, retention and termination of professional employees. The process involved (1) the selection and training of the nine teachers and nine administrators for the Teacher Evaluation Committee; (2) inservice training for evaluation of teachers through nine workshops; (3) establishing behavior criteria and standards in four performance areas (instructional skills, organizational and classroom management skills, professional performance, and interpersonal skills) and developing formative and summative evaluation instruments; (4) inservice administrator training on using the new instruments; (5) pilot testing the evaluation process with volunteer teachers; (6) analyzing the questionnaire and interview data from the pilot test; (7) field testing the revised evaluation process; and (8) making revisions for compliance with State of Texas House Bill 72 in regard to assigning teachers to career ladder levels based on observable, job-related behavior. Copies of the formative and summative evaluation report forms are appended. (BS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261089

A MULTIFACETED APPROACH TO TEACHER EVALUATION

Fae Lysiak
Anna Perez
Fort Worth Independent School District

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lysiak, Fae

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Paper Presented at the
American Educational Research Association National Convention
Chicago, Illinois

April, 1985

TM 850 513

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A MULTIFACETED APPROACH TO TEACHER EVALUATION

The purpose of this paper is to present the three-year process used in developing a teacher evaluation model. The purposes of the model were twofold:

1. To improve teaching skills, and
2. To enable those responsible for personnel decisions to make valid and reliable judgments concerning promotion, retention and termination of professional employees.

These purposes were to be accomplished by:

1. providing inservice training to line supervisors and teachers concerning evaluation instrumentation and the evaluation process, and
2. developing instrumentation on which personnel decisions could be based.

The model was based primarily on Dr. Richard Manatt's School Improvement Model for Teacher Performance Evaluation.

The Fort Worth Independent School District (FWISD) expectations for professional employees are established in specific performance standards. Although job-specific standards were available, the evaluation instrumentation and processes had little, if any, correlation with those standards. In 1981 the Fort Worth Classroom Teacher's Association (FWCTA) expressed concerns regarding the current teacher evaluation process and requested that improvements to that process be made. The purposes of the new teacher evaluation process, then, were to link improved teacher performance to student learning and to make personnel decisions valid and reliable.

Teachers, principals and administrators were interviewed to determine their perceptions of the present evaluation procedures. Results of the interviews indicated a dissatisfaction with evaluation instrumentation and processes in three main areas:

1. a lack of clear evaluative criteria,
2. poor observational skills of evaluators, and
3. communication regarding the evaluative process.

A teacher evaluation committee was formed to address these concerns and was charged with the responsibility of revising the existing teacher evaluation system.

SELECTION AND TRAINING OF THE TEACHER EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Work on the teacher evaluation process began in 1981. The committee was comprised of nine teachers selected by the FWCTA and nine administrators chosen by the Superintendent of Schools. Initially, the committee members indicated that the project was worthwhile, but they felt that a comprehensive needs assessment and review of the current status of research on teacher evaluation should be undertaken. Several months were spent in reviewing current teacher evaluation procedures of school districts in Texas and other major cities in other states. In addition, the following workshops and seminars were offered as part of their preparation:

1. DETEK: A Developmental Teacher Evaluation System
   Dr. Ben T. Harris, Southwestern Evaluation and Development Lab, Austin Texas.

2. Clinical Supervision
   Sue Wells

3. Outcome Based Instruction
   FWISD Staff

4. Mastery Learning
   Madeline Hunter

5. Teacher Evaluation Workshop
   Richard Manatt

6. Staff Evaluation
   Linda Wood Ward, Director of Staff Development and Area Superintendent, Richardson ISD, Richardson, Texas

INSERVICE TRAINING FOR EVALUATORS OF TEACHERS

Inservice training in effective instructional strategies and Mastery Learning had been provided for district teachers since 1975. Local staff development personnel combined the concepts into Outcome Based Instruction, a 12-hour teacher inservice program. Outcome Based Instruction workshops were provided to all teachers and instructional aides beginning in the summer of 1981. Evaluation of the workshops indicated that instructional personnel felt that administrators should have similar training if they were to evaluate teachers. Workshops were provided for administrators in the following areas:

1. Clinical Supervision: Assessing and Improving the Instructional Process
2. Evaluating Teacher Performance (conducted by Richard Manatt)
3. Effective Time Management
4. Microcomputers in the Classroom
5. Effective Decision Making
6. Management Trends for the 80's.
7. Leadership Effectiveness Training
8. Outcome Based Instruction
9. Classroom Observation (conducted by Shirley B. Stow)

THE DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS

Development of the philosophy and purpose of the evaluation process was begun by the committee under the direction of two external consultants. Behavioral characteristics required of district teachers and performance areas for evaluation were established. The committee was divided into groups which established criteria and descriptors in four broad areas:

1. instructional skills
2. organizational and management skills
3. professional performance
4. interpersonal skills

A five point Likert-type scale (including descriptors) for rating performance level was developed for summative and formative evaluation. (see Appendix) Other instruments which were developed addressed the areas of teacher self-assessment, preobservation skills, and targeting job improvement. (see Appendix)

RELIABILITY

Because the focus of teacher evaluation involved improving teacher competency and making personnel decisions which affect the employment status of professional personnel, a high degree of reliability in the evaluation process was sought. At the conclusion of the field test phase, test-retest and split-half reliability coefficients will be calculated. Data will be available in March 1985.

Interrater reliability was established through the following design:

Eight administrators responsible for teacher evaluation were identified based on the amount of training received in clinical supervision, outcome based instruction, mastery learning and mastery teaching. Each administrator viewed an identical videotaped instructional scenario and rated the scenarios using the developed instruments. A correlation of items between raters was calculated. Revisions to the items were made and presented to the committee. Administrators then used the revised instrument in rating a different instructional scenario.

INSERVICE TRAINING WITH NEW INSTRUMENTATION

In August 1983, district administrators were given the opportunity to review the newly developed evaluation instruments. Additionally, administrators were assessed on instructional terminology and evaluation skills so that individualized inservice activities could be developed. Instructional terminology assessment was accomplished through a 40-item multiple choice instrument developed by Dr. Madeline Hunter and Dr. Richard Manatt. The instrument measured the ability to identify instructional strategies at the application level. Evaluation skills assessment required the administrators to view a thirty minute videotaped instructional scenario, take field notes, and analyze each scenario. After the instructional scenario was analyzed, administrators completed a formative evaluation instrument. The 21-item formative evaluation instrument had been previously normed. Scores from the instructional terminology instrument and the formative evaluation instrument were used to identify nine possible areas which

were viewed as a profile for inservice training. The Department of Staff Development provided inservice training to supervisors of principals and supervisors of administrators who evaluate teachers. Inservice training focused on conducting an administrative assessment conference and advising teachers of areas in which skill improvement was needed as indicated by the evaluation. As a result, each administrator in the district was individually conferenced by the immediate supervisor regarding results on the administrator assessment. Additionally, inservice training was provided by the Department of Staff Development to principals and other evaluators of teachers on instructional and evaluation skills that were a part of the teacher evaluation instruments.

PILOT TESTING THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The total evaluation process was available for piloting during the 1983-84 school year. Central administrators were asked to pilot the instrument with one volunteer teacher. The principals were asked to pilot the instruments with at least one and no more than three teahcers on a voluntary basis. Six school principals were asked to use the instrument with at least one-third of their techers. These were to be teachers who would volunteer and would not be evaluated on the former evaluation instruments as part of their formal summative evaluation.

Interviews and questionnaries were used to assess the effectiveness of the evaluation process. Research questions for the interview

instrument and the questionnaire were formulated by the evaluation committee. Perceptions of the evaluation process by evaluators and teachers were determined through the questionnaire. All personnel involved in the process completed this instrument. In the six schools where one-third of the teachers were evaluated using the new instruments, principals were interviewed by a member of the evaluation committee. Two teachers involved in the pilot from each of these six schools were randomly selected and interviewed by a committee member.

DATA ANALYSIS OF PILOT TESTING

Results from the questionnaires and interviews were analyzed separately for evaluators and teachers. Results of the questionnaires indicated that administrators and teachers perceived the new teacher evaluation process to be satisfactory in meeting the major purposes of the evaluation. In other words, the new evaluation process could be used to help teachers improve their skills, and valid and reliable decisions could be made regarding professional personnel. The evaluation process was seen as beneficial in promoting professional growth, correcting weaknesses, and enhancing strengths of the teacher.

Two areas of disagreement between evaluators and teachers were noted. Evaluators generally felt the evaluation process did not improve the working relationship between evaluator and teacher. In fact, forty-eight percent indicated a deterioration in the relationship between evaluator and teacher resulted from the evaluation process. Teachers, on the other hand, felt the relationship had improved or

remained constant. The other area of disagreement regarding the process involved secondary teachers' perceptions of the evaluator's competence. Secondary teachers felt that evaluators were not qualified to evaluate instruction in every subject area. Evaluators at both the elementary and secondary levels did not agree with this perception.

The pilot testing of the evaluation process produced many suggestions for improving the instruments, timelines, procedures, and inservice for evaluators. This information was provided to the committee as they began revising the evaluation process.

FIELD TESTING THE REVISED EVALUATION PROCESS

After the revision of the evaluation process, all instruments were reviewed with principals and other evaluators prior to the opening of the 1984-85 school year. The field test of the evaluation process followed the same format as the pilot test phase. Evaluators of teachers viewed videotaped instructional episodes, evaluated the episodes, and were given the written test to measure their knowledge of instructional practice. Additional training was provided to those evaluators whose scores did not reach the specified criterion level.

A random sample of two teachers from each elementary school and three teachers from each secondary school was selected to be evaluated on the new evaluation instruments. In addition, these teachers were also evaluated using the former evaluation instruments. The use of the

former instruments was necessitated by placement of all teachers on a career ladder. All evaluation instruments will be returned to the FWISD Department of Planning, Research, and Evaluation in March 1985. Questionnaire and interview data will be collected and analyzed. Analysis of these data will allow revisions to be made in the evaluation process for district-wide implementation in the 1985-86 school year.

A complete set of evaluative instruments, the district philosophy and guideline are found in the Appendix. Further data on the effectiveness of these instruments will be available following the field test phase of the project (approximately March 1985).

COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE OF TEXAS' REGULATIONS

In order that the new evaluation process and instrumentation be in compliance with the State of Texas House Bill 72 (an education reform act), revisions are currently being made. House Bill 72 stipulates that each teacher shall be assigned to a career ladder level. The career ladder level assignment is based on performance, experience, job-related education, advanced academic training, and job assignments. Criteria for placement on the career ladder must be based on observable, job-related behavior. To comply with the regulations of House Bill 72 a conversion table was developed to equate summative evaluation findings with performance categories.

DISCUSSION

Current efforts in the revision of the teacher evaluation process have focused on developing a model which is sensitive to improving teacher skills and one which is usable in decision-making for professional employment practices. The model presented here is unique in that the skill level of those who evaluate teachers is first assessed and remediation in skill level deficiencies is addressed through inservice training. The model has provided for revisions in the evaluation process through pilot and field testing phases. Compliance with Texas law concerning career ladder placement has been accomplished. Generally, both evaluators of teachers and teachers are satisfied with the new evaluation process.

The committment of the Teacher Evaluation Committee and the support of the administration and the school board has made the development of the evaluation model possible. The committee continues to refine the model in an effort to make it both practical and reliable. It is believed that as staff evaluation improves, teacher performance will improve and students will benefit with improved levels of achievement.

Summative Evaluation Report

Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

Teacher's Name	Years Experience in District	Building

Evaluatee's Signature	Date	Evaluator's Signature	Date

Directions:

*Beside each criterion, please check the phrase which best describes the appraisee's performance on that item.

*Each item **must** be completed. At the end of each performance area section a comment space has been provided. Use of this space is encouraged, particularly if a low level of performance has been checked for any of the criteria in that section.

Performance Area I: Instructional Skills

Criteria	**Levels of Performance**		**STANDARD**	
The teacher. . .				
A. Demonstrates ability to motivate students.	Not Observed	The teacher's unrealistic expectations (either high or low) discourage students from performing according to their abilities.	The teacher inconsistently motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.	The teacher clearly expects and motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher motivates students to achieve beyond previous performance levels.
B. Demonstrates effective teaching techniques.	Not Observed	Techniques are inappropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson.	The teacher intermittently uses techniques which are appropriate to the objectives of the lesson.	The teacher uses techniques which are appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher uses a variety of relevant teaching techniques.
C. Provides opportunities for successful learning experiences for each pupil at his/her ability level.	Not Observed	The teacher neither recognizes nor provides for individual student needs.	The teacher recognizes but does not provide for individual student needs.	The teacher recognizes and provides for individual student needs.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher shows sensitivity in helping the class to understand and provide for individual needs.
D. Communicates effectively with students.	Not Observed	Communications from the teacher are frequently unclear, students often appear confused.	Communications from the teacher are usually clear but relevant student input is not encouraged.	Communications from the teacher are clear. Relevant dialogue is encouraged.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher is skillful in using a variety of verbal and non-verbal communications.
E. Provides students with specific oral/written & with-evaluative feedback.	Not Observed	The teacher gives no evaluative feedback.	The teacher is inconsistent in giving evaluative feedback.	The teacher gives specific evaluative feedback.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher gives feedback with reinforcment and encouragement.
F. Uses appropriate formal/informal evaluation activities.	Not Observed	The teacher uses evaluation activities which are irrelevant to the instructional objective(s).	The teacher uses evaluation activities which are marginally related to the instructional objective(s).	The teacher uses evaluation activities which are related to the instructional objective(s).	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher uses evaluation activities which meet the needs of individual students.

Evaluator's Comments	Evaluatee's Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summative Evaluation Report

Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

Teacher's Name	Years Experience in District	Building

Evaluatee's Signature	Date	Evaluator's Signature	Date

Directions:

*Beside each criterion, please check the phrase which best describes the appraisee's performance on that item.

*Each item **must** be completed. At the end of each performance area section a comment space has been provided. Use of this space is encouraged, particularly if a low level of performance has been checked for any of the criteria in that section.

Performance Area II: Organizational and Classroom Management Skills

Criteria The teacher. . .	Levels of Performance			STANDARD	
A. Organizes the educational setting.	Not Observed	The teacher displays little or no skill in organizing the educational setting.	The educational setting is ineffectively organized, i.e., the teacher uses activities which are inappropriate for the physical environment.	A functional classroom environment is maintained. Appropriate activities are selected.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher assesses and adjusts the educational setting to provide for a variety of learning styles.
B. Demonstrates evidence of personal organization.	Not Observed	The teacher is disorganized in lesson preparation and organization.	The teacher intermittently presents materials in an organized manner.	Appropriate lesson preparation and organization of work is evident, i.e., materials are available; presentations progress logically.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher shows evidence of long range planning.
C. Organizes students for effective instruction.	Not Observed	There is little or no evidence of established classroom routine; students appear to be confused.	The teacher is inconsistent and/or ineffective in maintaining classroom routine.	The teacher has established an effective classroom routine which students clearly understand.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher involves the students in establishing/maintaining classroom routine.
D. Creates an orderly environment conducive to learning.	Not Observed	The teacher displays poor classroom management.	The teacher is ineffective and/or inconsistent in classroom management.	The teacher clearly communicates and enforces the expected standards of behavior.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher recognizes and works to eliminate causes of undesirable student behavior.
E. Promotes student self-discipline and responsibility.	Not Observed	The teacher discourages students from being responsible and self-disciplined through constant exposure to activities requiring dependency.	The teacher inconsistently provides opportunities for students to develop responsibility/self-discipline.	The teacher provides opportunities for students to demonstrate responsible behavior and self-discipline through activities requiring independence	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher encourages all students to demonstrate responsible behaviors in a wide variety of settings; e.g., through independent study, enrichment activities, and group leadership roles.

Evaluator's Comments	Evaluatee's Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summative Evaluation Report

Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

Teacher's Name | Years Experience in District | Building

Evaluatee's Signature | Date | Evaluator's Signature | Date

Directions:

*Beside each criterion, please check the phrase which best describes the appraisee's performance on that item.

*Each item **must** be completed. At the end of each performance area section a comment space has been provided. Use of this space is encouraged, particularly if a low level of performance has been checked for any of the criteria in that section.

Performance Area III: Professional Performance

Criteria The teacher. . .	**Levels of Performance**			**STANDARD**	
A. Demonstrates a sense of professional responsibility.	Not Observed	The teacher does not fulfill expected professional responsibilities.	The teacher frequently needs to be reminded to meet professional responsibilities.	The teacher fulfills professional responsibilities.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher is self-motivated and promotes professional responsibility in fellow staff members.
B. Demonstrates evidence of professional ethics through support of school regulations and policies.	Not Observed	The teacher does not comply with school regulations and policies.	The teacher intermittently cooperates in supporting school regulations and policies.	The teacher supports school regulations and policies.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher stays informed and/or participates in development and review of school regulations and policies.
C. Works to improve teaching skills.	Not Observed	The teacher seldom participates in professional growth activities.	When directed, the teacher participates in professional growth activities.	The teacher seeks out and voluntarily participates in relevant professional growth activities.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher initiates or directs professional growth activities and encourages other staff members to participate.
D. Demonstrates academic proficiency.	Not Observed	Teacher fails to demonstrate proficiency in basic skills and area(s) of certification.	Teacher inconsistently demonstrates proficiency in basic skills and area(s) of certification.	Teacher consistently demonstrates proficiency in basic skills and area(s) of certification.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher demonstrates superior proficiency in basic skills and area(s) of certification.
E. Links personal professional goals to school district goals.	Not Observed	The teacher's goals are incompatible with school district goals.	The teacher goals are partially compatible with school district goals.	The teacher links professional goals to school district goals.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher promotes school district goals among colleagues.

Evaluator's Comments

Evaluatee's Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summative Evaluation Report

Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

Teacher's Name | Years Experience in District | Building

Evaluatee's Signature | Date | Evaluator's Signature | Date

Directions:

"Beside each criterion, please check the phrase which best describes the appraisee's performance on that item.

"Each item must be completed. At the end of each performance area section a comment space has been provided. Use of this space is encouraged, particularly if a low level of performance has been checked for any of the criteria in that section.

Performance Area IV: Interpersonal Skills

Criteria The teacher. . .	Levels of Performance			STANDARD	
A. Expresses concern for all students regardless of cultural, academic, or intellectual status.	Not Observed	The teacher expresses and/or demonstrates obvious signs of stereotyping when relating to students.	The teacher inconsistently recognizes and relates to individual differences of students.	the teacher expresses concern for all students as evidenced by materials used in and interactions with the class.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher involves students in activities to create an understanding and acceptance of individual differences.
B. Demonstrates awareness of the needs of students.	Not Observed	The teacher does not provide for individual capabilities of students or demonstrate awareness of student needs.	The teacher intermittently provides for individual capabilities of student and demonstrates awareness of student needs.	The teacher teaches to student capabilities and meets student needs.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher provides remedial and/or enrichment activities and assists students in meeting their own needs.
C. Demonstrates sensitivity in communicating with students.	Not Observed	The teacher is unresponsive to the needs of students.	The teacher intermittently shows sensitivity in communicating with students.	The teacher demonstrates sensitivity in relating to all students.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher willingly provides extra time for individuals.
D. Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships with school, parents, and community.	Not Observed	The teacher avoids interactions with school personnel, parents, and community.	The teacher intermittently cooperates with school personnel, parents, and community.	The teacher has a good working relationship with school personnel, parents, and community.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher encourages school, parent, and community interactions.
E. Displays calmness and maturity in actions and reactions.	Not Observed	The teacher exhibits little or no self-control	The teacher is inconsistent in exhibiting self-control.	The teacher exhibits self-control; is calm and poised and deals appropriately with student behavior.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher serves as a positive role model for students.

Evaluator's Comments

Evaluatee's Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Formative Evaluation Report

Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

:acher's Name	Years Experience in District	Building

:aluatee's Signature	Date	Evaluator's Signature	Date

rections:

*Beside each criterion, please check the phrase which best describes the appraisee's performance on that item.

*Each item must be completed. At the end of each performance area section a comment space has been provided. Use of this space is encouraged, particularly if a low level of performance has been checked for any of the criteria in that section.

:rformance Area I: Instructional Skills

riteria	**Levels of Performance**		**STANDARD**		
ne teacher. . .					
Demonstrates ability to motivate students.	The teacher's unrealistic expectations (either high or low) discourage students from performing according to their abilities.	The teacher inconsistently motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.	The teacher clearly expects and motivates students to perform assigned tasks according to their abilities.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher motivates students to achieve beyond previous performance levels.	Not Obser
Demonstrates effective teaching techniques	Techniques are inappropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson.	The teacher intermittently uses techniques which are appropriate to the objectives of the lesson.	The teacher uses techniques which are appropriate to the objective(s) of the lesson.	In addition to meeting the standard the teacher uses a variety of relevant teaching techniques.	Not Obser
Provides opportunities for successful learning experiences for each pupil at his/her ability level	The teacher neither recognizes nor provides for individual student needs.	The teacher recognizes but does not provide for individual student needs.	The teacher recognizes and provides for individual student needs.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher shows sensitivity in helping the class to understand and provide for individual needs.	Not Obser
Communicates effectively with students.	Communications from the teacher are frequently unclear, students often appear confused.	Communications ..om the teacher are usually clear but relevant student input is not encouraged.	Communications from the teacher are clear. Relevant dialogue is encouraged.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher is skillful in using a variety of verbal and non-verbal communications.	Not Obser
Provides students with specific oral/written evaluative feedback.	The teacher gives no evaluative feedback.	The teacher is inconsistent in giving evaluative feedback.	The teacher gives specific evaluative feedback.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher gives feedback with reinforcement and encouragement.	Not Obser
Uses appropriate formal/informal evaluation activities.	The teacher uses evaluation activities which are irrelevant to the instructional objective(s).	The teacher uses evaluation activities which are marginally related to the instructional objective(s).	The teacher uses evaluation activities which are related to the instructional objective(s)	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher uses evaluation activities which meet the needs of individual students.	Not Obser

.valuator's Comments	Evaluatee's Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Formative Evaluation Report

Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

Teacher's Name	Years Experience in District	Building

Evaluatee's Signature	Date	Evaluator's Signature	Date

Directions:

*Beside each criterion, please check the phrase which best describes the appraisee's performance on that item.

*Each item must be completed. At the end of each performance area section a comment space has been provided. Use of this space is encouraged, particularly if a low level of performance has been checked for any of the criteria in that section.

Performance Area II: Organizational and Classroom Management Skills

Criteria	Levels of Performance		STANDARD		
The teacher. . .					
. Organizes the educational setting.	The teacher displays little or no skill in organizing the educational setting.	The educational setting is ineffectively organized, i.e., the teacher uses activities which are inappropriate for the physical environment.	A functional classroom environment is maintained. Appropriate activities are selected.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher assesses and adjusts the educational setting to provide for a variety of learning styles.	Not Observ
. Demonstrates evidence of personal organization	The teacher is disorganized in lesson preparation and organization.	The teacher intermittently presents materials in an organized manner.	Appropriate lesson preparation and organization of work is evident, i.e., materials are available; presentations progress logically.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher shows evidence of long range planning.	Not Observ
. Organizes students for effective instruction.	There is little or no evidence of established classroom routine; students appear to be confused.	The teacher is inconsistent and/or ineffective in maintaining classroom routine.	The teacher has established an effective classroom routine which students clearly understand.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher involves the students in establishing/maintaining classroom routine.	Not Observ
. Creates an orderly environment conducive to learning.	The teacher displays poor classroom management.	The teacher is ineffective and/or inconsistent in classroom management.	The teacher clearly communicates and enforces the expected standards of behavior.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher recognizes and works to eliminate causes of undesirable student behavior.	Not Observ
. Promotes student self-discipline and responsibility.	The teacher dissuades students from being responsible and self-disciplined through constant exposure to activities requiring dependency.	The teacher inconsistently provides opportunities for students to develop responsibility/self-discipline.	The teacher provides opportunities for students to demonstrate responsible behavior and self-discipline through activities requiring independence.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher encourages all students to demonstrate responsible behaviors in a wide variety of settings; e.g., through independent study, enrichment activities, and group leadership roles.	Not Observ

Evaluator's Comments	Evaluatee's Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Formative Evaluation Report

Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

Teacher's Name	Years Experience in District	Building

Evaluatee's Signature	Date	Evaluator's Signature	Date

Directions:

*Beside each criterion, please check the phrase which best describes the appraisee's performance on that item.

*Each item must be completed. At the end of each performance area section a comment space has been provided. Use of this space is encouraged, particularly if a low level of performance has been checked for any of the criteria in that section.

Performance Area III: Professional Performance

Criteria The teacher. . .	Levels of Performance		STANDARD		
A. Demonstrates a sense of professional responsibility	The teacher does not fulfill expected professional responsibilities.	The teacher frequently needs to be reminded to meet professional responsibilities.	The teacher fulfills professional responsibilities.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher is self-motivated and promotes professional responsibility in fellow staff members.	Not Observed
B. Demonstrates evidence of professional ethics through support of school regulations and policies	The teacher does not comply with school regulations and policies.	The teacher intermittently cooperates in supporting school regulations and policies.	The teacher supports school regulations and policies.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher stays informed and/or participates in development and review of school regulations and policies.	Not Observed
C. Works to improve teaching skills.	The teacher seldom participates in professional growth activities.	When directed, the teacher participates in professional growth activities.	The teacher seeks out and voluntarily participates in relevant professional growth activities.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher initiates or directs professional growth activities and encourages other staff members to participate.	Not Observed
D. Demonstrates academic proficiency	Teacher fails to demonstrate proficiency in basic skills and area(s) of certification.	Teacher inconsistently demonstrates proficiency in basic skills and area(s) of certification.	Teacher consistently demonstrates proficiency in basic skills and area(s) of certification.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher demonstrates superior proficiency in basic skills and area(s) of certification.	Not Observed
E. Links personal professional goals to school district goals.	The teacher's goals are incompatible with school district goals.	The teacher's goals are partially compatible with school district goals.	The teacher links professional goals to school district goals.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher promotes school district goals among colleagues.	Not Observed

Evaluator's Comments	Evaluatee's Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Formative Evaluation Report

Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

Teacher's Name | Years Experience in District | Building

Evaluatee's Signature | Date | Evaluator's Signature | Date

Directions:

*Beside each criterion, please check the phrase which best describes the appraisee's performance on that item.

*Each item must be completed. At the end of each performance area section a comment space has been provided. Use of this space is encouraged, particularly if a low level of performance has been checked for any of the criteria in that section.

Performance Area IV: Interpersonal Skills

Criteria The teacher. . .	Levels of Performance		STANDARD		
A. Expresses concern for all students regardless of cultural, academic, or intellectual status.	The teacher expresses and/or demonstrates obvious signs of stereotyping when relating to students.	The teacher inconsistently recognizes and relates to individual differences of students.	The teacher expresses concern for students as evidenced by materials used in and interactions with the class.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher creates an environment which encourages students to demonstrate an understanding and acceptance of individual differences.	Not Observ
B. Demonstrates awareness of the needs of students.	The teacher does not provide for individual capabilities of students or demonstrate awareness of student needs.	The teacher intermittently provides for individual capabilities of student and demonstrates awareness of student needs.	The teacher teaches to student capabilities and meets student needs.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher promotes positive self-image and self-awareness.	Not Observ
C. Demonstrates sensitivity in communicating with students.	The teacher is insensitive to the needs of students.	The teacher intermittently shows sensitivity in communicating with students.	The teacher demonstrates sensitivity in communicating with students.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher willingly provides extra time for individual students.	Not Observ
D. Demonstrates effective interpersonal relationships with school, parents, and community.	The teacher avoids interactions with school personnel, parents, and community.	The teacher intermittently cooperates with school personnel, parents, and community.	The teacher demonstrates a good working relationship with school personnel, parents, and community.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher encourages school, parent, and community interactions.	Not Obser
E. Displays calmness and maturity in actions and reactions.	The teacher exhibits little or no self-control	The teacher is inconsistent in exhibiting self-control	The teacher exhibits self-control, is calm and poised.	In addition to meeting the standard, the teacher serves as a positive role model for students by exploring all sides of issues, concerns, and problems.	Not Obser

Evaluator's Comments

Evaluatee's Comments

BEST COPY AVAILABLE